

The Mantle of the Prophet: Churchill's Embodiment of the Prophetic Ethos

Andrew Bowman
University of Texas, Austin

Seen everywhere from posters to coffee mugs, Winston Churchill's words remain a source of public fascination over fifty years after his death. Through a study of the evolution of Churchill's ethos construction in the speeches he gave before and during World War II, this article examines the link between Churchill's continued cultural relevance and his persuasive power. Using the theory of prophetic ethos as a conceptual framework, this essay analyzes the changes in Churchill's tone, style, and word choice between speeches given before and after he became prime minister, concluding that he adopted a prophetic rhetoric. By embodying a prophetic persona, Churchill persuaded the British public to share his vision of Britain's eventual victory over Nazi Germany.

In the summer of 2012, fifty-eight years after his death, Winston Churchill almost caused an international incident. The White House was criticized for returning a bust of the British prime minister to the British, an action characterized by the American conservative press as an anti-British rebuke on the part of the Obama administration. After denying that the bust had been returned, the White House press secretary quelled the controversy by revealing that there were in fact two busts of Churchill by the same artist. One had been on loan to President Bush and had been returned after he left office. The other remained in the White House art collection ("Oops!").

The most fascinating detail in this story is its indication of Churchill's enduring political power. Even after his death, he is held up as a symbol of democratic leadership in a country of which he was not the leader. While American reverence for figures like Washington and Lincoln can be easily explained by the roles these men played in the founding and shaping of the American republic, the source of Churchill's symbolic capital to an American audience is harder to locate. As is the case with Lincoln, Churchill's speeches remain as popular as the man himself. Phrases like "an iron curtain" are as recognizably Churchill as the marble bust of the man himself. The Churchill known by modern Americans is not him; instead, they know the image of him that he himself created through his words. While rhetorical scholars have examined these words, their work fails to locate the unique quality of Churchill's oratory that continues to inspire popular interest.

Even during Churchill's lifetime, scholars analyzed his speeches in an attempt to explain his methods of persuasion. In his article published in 1947, "Churchill's Speech on the Munich Agreement," Halbert F. Gulley engages in a classical rhetorical analysis of Churchill's speech, examining the political position from which Churchill gave his address, the makeup of the speech's audience, Churchill's persuasive goals as stated in the speech, and the effectiveness of Churchill's persuasion. Similarly, Michael J. Hostetler's article, "The Enigmatic Ends of Rhetoric: Churchill's Fulton Address as Great Art and Failed Persuasion," published in 1997, undertakes a similar close-reading evaluation of one of Churchill's speeches. These articles offer insight into Churchill's rhetorical decision-making process specific to the cases they study, but they examine individual speeches in a vacuum and fail to capture the evolving quality of Churchill's ethos and the persuasive power this evolution afforded him.

Other scholars have examined the body of Churchill's work as a whole, but these analyses also fail to examine Churchill's use of ethical appeals. In "Churchill the Phrase Forger," Manfred Weidhorn examines the creation or adaptation that resulted in Churchill's most memorable phrases. Charles W. Lomas' article, published in 1958, "Churchill's Concept of His Audiences," identifies the different types of audiences addressed by Churchill, stating, "Like most British statesmen of the first rank, Churchill has appeared before audiences in three roles: as the politician on the hustings, as the Parliamentary debater, and as the national leader molding public opinion on vital issues" (75). Lomas addresses how Churchill viewed these disparate audiences and how he adapted his rhetoric to influence them. While both Weidhorn and Lomas highlight Churchill's rhetorical skills, neither author places those skills into a broader framework that explains his persuasive power or his continued popular relevance. Studying how Churchill constructed his ethos in his speeches could offer that framework.

The roots of Churchill's personal fame can be found in his rhetorical evolution. Over the course of his oratorical career, the image of Churchill we see in his words, his ethos, changes. In this article, I will illustrate the evolution of Churchill's ethos and show how he embodied the prophetic ethos by undergoing a conversion experience, claiming to see a truth to which others were blind, and placing the realization of that truth over personal concerns. I will show how this framework of the prophetic ethos provides a means of conceptualizing Churchill's various rhetorical skills as a cohesive pattern of enduring persuasion.

Churchill's Position Before World War II

Churchill is famously quoted as saying, "History shall be kind to me for I intend to write it." Churchill did indeed write many histories, winning the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1953, but even without his written accounts of the past, Churchill and his legacy have shaped the narrative of World War II. From classes in history and rhetoric to posters and coffee mugs, the persistent image of Churchill presents him as the old, irascible leader whose words helped motivate the British public to resist the Nazi onslaught of their island home. This popular image suspends Churchill at the moment of his greatest accomplishments, but it does not show the whole man. In order to illustrate how Churchill began to embody the prophetic ethos, his work before he accepted the mantle of the prophet must be analyzed.

While many remember his rise to leadership at the beginning of WWII, fewer recall just how far he had previously fallen. After the defeat of the Conservative Party at the polls on 30 May 1929, Churchill lost his post as chancellor of the exchequer and resigned himself to a place in the Conservative shadow parliament in opposition to the new Labour government (Gilbert 491). Soon after this electoral defeat Churchill found himself at odds with his own party regarding the British government's policy towards India. While the other members of the Conservative Party (including the party leadership) had agreed with Labour's plan to grant India dominion status and start it on the path to independence, on 26 January 1930 Churchill delivered a speech in Parliament disagreeing with the Conservative position. He argued that the plan would cause the United Kingdom to lose India forever (498). While this commitment to imperialism would obviously seem anathema to today's British public, even in 1930 many of Churchill's peers in the House of Commons saw his position as out of touch. His position on Indian independence and British authority is perhaps best contextualized in his description of Gandhi as "a seditious Middle Temple lawyer . . . striding half-naked up the steps of the Viceregal palace . . . to parley on equal terms with the representative of the King-Emperor" (499). Churchill argued that this meeting between the British viceroy of India and Gandhi encouraged "all the forces which are hostile to British authority" (500).

His unpopular view of Britain's ideal role in India placed Churchill on the outskirts not just of

his party but of the entire British Parliament. After the ousting of the Labour government, a national unity government composed of all of the parties was formed. While the government made room for Conservatives, Liberals, and Labour, there was little room for Churchill; Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald offered him no position in the new government (Gilbert 502). Even as Churchill hemorrhaged political capital, he continued to fight against Indian self-government. On 3 December 1930, when the prime minister called for parliamentary approval of the government's plan for gradual independence for India, Churchill insisted on offering a dissenting plan, which the House of Commons rejected by a vote of 369 to 43 (503). The defeat represents Churchill's fall from grace.

Churchill's new role as an outsider came at an inconvenient time. Just as India backed away from British control, Germany began to appear threatening once again, at least in Churchill's view. While many in the government argued that the only way to prevent a future war was through disarmament, Churchill argued that Britain's best defense against threats was to maintain military parity with the other great powers of Europe. Like his position on India, Churchill's hawkish stance on disarmament initially isolated him further from the consensus of his peers in government and the British public (Gilbert 506). Even when his insistence on strategic military readiness began to gain limited support, he continued to play the role of gadfly. After the 1935 general election, some believed Churchill would again fill a cabinet post, but Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin gave Churchill no position in the government and shot down Churchill's rearmament plan (547). Churchill would remain an outsider looking in, an MP with little power, until shortly before becoming prime minister at the beginning of World War II.

The "Munich Agreement" Speech

When Churchill gave a speech to the House of Commons on 5 October 1938 after the passage of the Munich Agreement, he was still an outsider. The agreement appeased Hitler by allowing Germany to annex part of Czechoslovakia inhabited by ethnic Germans. Churchill had argued for strategic military readiness since 1932, but no one had appeared to be listening. That did not stop Churchill from continuing to sound the trumpet of war readiness and warn against international threats. Many cheered "Peace in our time" when Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain returned from his negotiations with Germany and the other European powers after the passage of the Munich Agreement, but Churchill was not one of them. In the speech he labeled the agreement "a total and unmitigated defeat" for Britain.

While Churchill had not yet begun to embody the prophetic ethos, his "Munich Agreement" speech foreshadows his later use of prophetic rhetoric. In his definition of prophetic ethos, James Darsey, a professor of communication at Georgia State University who studies rhetorical theory and social movements, argues that prophets come "from the wilderness" ("The Legend" 435). In order to affect the systemic change inherent in the application of the prophetic ethos, the rhetor must come from outside the system. History tells us that Churchill was out of power when he delivered this speech, and indeed he makes his outsider status clear throughout his address. Because his audience already knows that he is unpopular, Churchill's decision to include the phrase "this is certainly not the time when it is worth anyone's while to court political popularity" sets a combative tone for the speech that will follow. Discussing the promised defense of Czechoslovakia by the British military, Churchill argues, "His Majesty's Government refused to give that guarantee when it would have saved the situation, yet in the end they gave it when it was too late, and now, for the future, they renew it when they have not the slightest power to make it good." Here Churchill again casts himself as an outsider through his use of third-person pronouns to describe those in power. When he speaks of the government as a group, he says "they" and not "we." Through this use of the third person, Churchill refuses to count himself as a member in the government. Towards the

end of the speech, Churchill makes his outsider status overt: “I remember for two years having to face, not only the Government’s deprecation, but their stern disapproval.” By arguing that the government both did not take him seriously and disapproved of his opinions, Churchill clearly sets himself as separate from that government. Positioning himself on the outside allows him to enter from the wilderness when he begins to embody the prophetic ethos.

At its heart, Churchill’s “Munich Agreement” speech is an invective laid at the feet of those who failed to heed his many warnings about Germany. The epideictic diatribe blames the British Parliament for allowing Germany’s power and influence to grow unchecked. Throughout the address, Churchill reminds his audience of the numerous warnings he gave. “I have tried my best to urge the maintenance of every bulwark of defense.” In the same breath, he reminds the audience that those warnings were ignored: “It has been in vain. Every position have been successively undermined and abandoned.” Put simply, Churchill’s speech is a beautifully articulated “I told you so.”

It is the “I” in this “I told you so” that makes it clear that Churchill has yet to engage in prophecy. Darsey’s definition of the prophetic ethos (which I will examine below) states that prophets must efface themselves and surrender personal concerns. This speech represents Churchill’s very personal belief that *he* was ignored, and if *his* advice had been followed, then “events would not have fallen into this disastrous state.” While this speech shows no evidence of Churchill’s use of the prophetic ethos, it both establishes the necessary conditions for him to later embody that ethos, and it offers a point of comparison to show how Churchill’s rhetoric changed after he accepted the mantle of the prophet.

The Prophetic Ethos

The concept of the prophetic ethos can be seen as a specific application of Aristotle’s general view that the ethos of a speaker is established through the speaker’s words, not his or her actions. In order to embody the prophetic ethos, a rhetor must construct a narrative that makes him or her appear to be a visionary figure. This narrative includes a conversion experience, a prophetic vision, the charismatic promulgation of that vision, and the self-effacement that shows that the rhetor values the prophetic vision above him- or herself.

While several scholars have examined the prophetic ethos, Darsey provides the most succinct explanation of the theory. Darsey’s organizational schema of these prerequisite parts offers a template by which the various discussions of the prophetic ethos can be reconciled, as well as an outline that will aid the specific study of the prophetic ethos in Churchill’s rhetoric. Using Darsey’s schema, I will argue that Churchill adopted this prophetic persona in his speeches made right after the war began.

Prophetic Vision and Charisma

Prophetic vision is the capacity to see truths to which others are blind. In “The Legend of Eugene Debs: Prophetic Ethos as Radical Argument,” Darsey identifies charisma as the source of this supernatural vision, specifically referencing Max Weber’s work on the concept. In “An Analysis of Weber’s Work on Charisma,” Thomas E. Dow, Jr. outlines the evolution of Weber’s views on charisma and its role in leadership. Dow paraphrases Weber’s first view, which was presented in *Theory of Social and Economic Organization*: “Charismatic authority is said to exist when an individual’s claim to ‘specific gifts of body and mind’ is acknowledged by others as a valid basis for their participation in an extraordinary programme of action.” Followers of a charismatic leader leave behind “respect for rule and tradition” and “surrender . . . to the extraordinary, and the unheard-of, to what is alien to all tradition and therefore is viewed as divine” (83). Prophetic vision serves as the charismatic leader’s justification to both seek and exercise power.

Because of their capacity to see truths that others cannot, those who embody the prophetic ethos have the authority to call upon their followers to take any actions they deem necessary. Their prophetic vision, which their followers see as otherworldly or divine, justifies their decisions. Because charisma “is an irrational concept, beyond the pale of rational validation,” no rational or concrete evidence is necessary to support the assertions of the vision or the visionary (Darsey, “The Legend” 435).

In his “Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat” speech, Churchill fully accepts the role of prophet. The defining characteristics of any prophet are his prophetic vision and his charisma. Within the first sentence of his speech, “I beg to move, that this House welcomes the formation of a Government representing the united and inflexible resolve of the nation to prosecute the war with Germany to a victorious conclusion,” Churchill has already articulated his vision to his audience: victory over Germany. Churchill further defines this vision in the peroration of his speech, stating, “You ask, what is our aim? I can answer in one word: It is victory, victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror, victory, however long and hard the road may be; for without victory, there is no survival.” That vision of victory sits at the center of Churchill’s prophetic ethos. The charismatic source of this vision is clear when viewed in the context of the “Munich Agreement” speech. Churchill’s promise of victory stands opposed to the culture of appeasement that he lamented in his earlier address.

Churchill continues to show dedication to his prophetic vision in his “We Shall Fight Them on the Beaches” speech, delivered after the evacuation of Dunkirk on 4 June 1940. When Churchill describes the rescuers of Dunkirk, he always places emphasis on their dedication to their mission. He honors the members of the rescue fleet: “The numbers they have brought back are the measure of their devotion and their courage.” He honors the staff of the hospital ships similarly, saying, “The men and women on board them never faltered in their duty.” After praising specific members of the rescue party, Churchill argues, “A miracle of deliverance, achieved by valor, by perseverance, by perfect discipline, by faultless service, by resource, by skill, by unconquerable fidelity, is manifest to us all.” To paraphrase Churchill, the rescuers at Dunkirk achieved success because they believed in the necessity to help in the fight against Germany, and they dedicated themselves to that mission. Their belief also happens to be the prophetic vision that Churchill first establishes in “Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat” and then reiterates in the peroration to “We Shall Fight Them on the Beaches”:

I have, myself, full confidence that if all do their duty, if nothing is neglected, and if the best arrangements are made, as they are being made, we shall prove ourselves once again able to defend our Island home, to ride out the storm of war, and to outlive the menace of tyranny.

Churchill argues that the commitment to the vision of eventual victory he espouses resulted in the miraculous success of the Dunkirk evacuation. While this understanding of events could dampen the spirits of his listeners by confronting them with the sobering realities of the alternative—failure—it could also offer a hope whose shelf life is significantly longer than the fleeting happiness felt after a single strategic success. If Churchill’s auditors accept his understanding of events, then committing themselves to national solidarity against Germany could offer hope for successes similar to the miracle of Dunkirk.

Conversion Experience

While a rhetor’s prophetic vision represents the source of his persuasive power, the conversion experience marks the moment at which the rhetor receives that power. The conversion experience occurs when the truth inherent in the prophetic vision becomes visible to the rhetor. This moment marks the beginning of the rhetorical construction of the prophetic narrative. Darsey points out,

“The supernatural quality of conversion, the rebirth, the vision, must be conceded before the *ethos* can bear the weight of witness” (“The Legend” 440). By offering his or her audience a conversion narrative, the prophetic rhetor can begin to attract the disciples necessary for his or her prophetic vision to gain charismatic argumentative force.

Examples of conversion experiences abound in scholarship on prophetic ethos. In “Encountering Angelina Grimké,” Stephen H. Browne quotes Gerda Lerner to describe the moment when Grimké, an abolitionist and women’s rights advocate raised in the American South, took up the mantle of the prophet: “All of the years of floundering and searching had finally brought her to this single moment.” In writing *Slavery and the Boston Riot*, Grimké embraces her role as a prophet because the work represents a crystallization of her beliefs as well as the adoption of what Browne refers to as “an identity of sufficient strength to enter and help determine the course of public life” (60). This shift from passive to active involvement gives evidence of the depths of Grimké’s change.

In his study of the prophetic ethos as applied to Eugene Debs, Darsey offers another example of the conversion experience necessary to embody the prophetic ethos. When Debs, longtime leader of the American Communist Party, discusses his realization of the class struggle that Communism works to end, he describes “a swift succession of blows that blinded me for an instant and then opened wide my eyes . . . the class struggle was revealed” (“The Legend” 439). In this moment, Debs undergoes a transformation that offers him the “capacity to see the truth” (Jasinski 460). Darsey expands this explanation of the conversion process, saying that Debs’ transformation “involves an infection of spirit and passion, creating a new person, and the transition from darkness to light suggests the newness of life after the conversion” (“The Legend” 439). The use of light and dark metaphors and the explanation of the process as one of rebirth reinforce that the experience is a *transformation*. This is more than just a simple change. Darsey shows that Debs’ “consecration” completely altered his being.

The “Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat” speech as a whole represents Churchill’s conversion experience. While the “Munich Agreement” speech shows that Churchill had long held a sincere interest in the welfare of the British people, it also reveals that he cared about his pride. Churchill relies on shaming his audience members to persuade them of the horrors of appeasement. The speech is not about Churchill’s vision; it is about Parliament’s blindness. Churchill’s conditional language in the peroration of the speech, that Britain would continue to suffer “unless by a supreme recovery of moral health and martial vigour, we arise again and take our stand for freedom as in the olden time,” also reveals the uncertainty with which he still viewed Britain’s future with Germany in 1938.

In contrast, the 1940 “Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat” speech focuses on Churchill’s vision and lacks all uncertainty. Churchill does not say *I* will defeat Germany. He does not say that we will defeat Germany *if*. . . . Churchill’s change in rhetorical style illustrates that he had undergone his conversion experience when he accepted the position of prime minister. His uncertainty had been replaced with certainty when he received his vision, and the changes in his rhetorical style book-end his conversion.

Effacement of the Self

Because of the nature of the prophetic ethos, the prophetic rhetor’s vision acts as its own form of argument. In order for the rhetor’s audience members to accept the vision and the requirements necessary to realize that vision, they must see the vision as “genuinely inspired, thus more perfect than [their] own corrupted and fallible understandings” (Darsey, “The Legend” 435). The prophetic rhetor offers evidence of the divine nature of his or her vision “through effacement of the self.” Through “continuing testimony to his or her helplessness and loss of self, particularly self con-

ceived as a rational calculation faculty,” the prophetic rhetor ceases to exist as an independent agent and becomes an embodiment of his or her prophetic vision. Prophetic orators illustrate the abandonment of their identity separate from their prophetic vision by showing a “willingness to suffer” (436). Accepting or even inviting pain and death offers a prophetic rhetor’s audience evidence of the prophetic rhetor’s dedication to his or her vision.

It’s important to note that this willingness to suffer goes beyond mere acceptance. When Grimké states, “Truly, I often feel as if I were ready to go to prison and to death in the cause of justice, mercy and love . . . if I am called to go back to Carolina, it will not be long before I shall suffer persecution of some kind or another,” she does more than just accept her possible fate; she welcomes it (qtd. in Browne 60). Embracing this persecution shows both a commitment to her message and the importance of the message itself. Because she is willing to endure violence in defense of her beliefs, those beliefs appear ethically superior.

Darsey’s examination of the abolitionist Wendell Phillips in his book *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America* shows Phillips’ willingness to suffer in the man’s own words. Phillips compares himself to the Old Testament prophet Nathan:

The community has come to hate its reproving Nathan so bitterly, that even those whom the relenting part of it is beginning to regard as standard-bearers of the antislavery host think it unwise to avow any connection or sympathy with him. (81)

Phillips makes it clear that even members of the antislavery movement, his own people, renounce him. By accepting this fate (which can be seen through comparison to an Old Testament prophet), he provides evidence that he is the complete embodiment of his cause, the prophet.

The level of commitment that Churchill expresses to his prophetic vision illustrates his effacement before his people. Churchill tells his audience that the only things he has to offer in service to his goal are “blood, toil, tears and sweat.” By accepting the costs of prophecy, Churchill surrenders himself to the completion of the goal. He also makes it clear that he suffers gladly: “But I take up my task with buoyancy and hope.” This completes the willing surrender and loss of self that allow him to become a personification of his prophetic vision.

The self-effacement in “Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat” can most easily be seen by contrasting it to the way he presents himself in the “Munich Agreement” speech. In the Munich speech, Churchill separated himself from the government through the use of “I” and “them”; in this speech he connects himself with both the government and the public at large through the use of “we” and “our.” The struggle for victory against Germany is not Churchill’s cause; it is “our cause.” Just as Churchill overtly excluded himself in the Munich speech, he uses the last line of the later speech, “At this time I feel entitled to claim the aid of all, and I say, ‘come then, let us go forward together with our united strength,’” to include his audience in a shared struggle. In this way, Churchill ceases to be an independent actor and becomes a mouthpiece for the victorious vision he shares with his audience.

Churchill continues to efface himself throughout his wartime speeches. Throughout his presentation of the current state of the war in his speech “The Few,” delivered on 20 August 1940, Churchill reminds his audience, “We must not grudge these years of weary as we toil and struggle through them.” Churchill juxtaposes that suffering with the goal that necessitates it by reminding his listeners, “We are doing the finest thing in the world, and have the honour to be the sole champion of the liberties of all Europe.” Through the use of “we,” Churchill includes himself within the group that must accept the suffering brought upon by Britain’s conflict with the Nazis. This continued willingness to suffer maintains Churchill’s prophetic persona. By linking himself with the British people, he unites himself with the nation struggling to realize this prophetic vision. Churchill rearticulates the need for victory over comfort when he states, “The road to victory may

not be so long as we expect. But we have no right to count upon this. Be it long or short, rough or smooth, we mean to reach our journey's end." Churchill's words show his continued commitment to victory. He continues to exemplify the prophetic ethos, and the unity he argues for in this address allows him to realize that vision with the help of his people.

Conclusion

When Churchill became prime minister, Germany was only growing in power. The Blitz swept across Europe, and the German army looked unbeatable. France, Britain's last strong ally on the continent, was falling. Strategically, Britain should have sued for peace. But viewed historically, a British surrender at the beginning of World War II seems impossible. It is Churchill's power and legacy that he made surrender unthinkable. Before Churchill took power, the British government appeased Hitler. The Munich Agreement is evidence of that. Appeasement is what the public expected—and at first accepted. It took Churchill to confound expectations. He announced with certainty that Britain would defeat Germany. He had no evidence to support his assertion. He was the evidence. His charismatic leadership changed the way a nation thought about its power and place in the world. By effacing himself, dedicating his speeches solely to defeating the Nazis, Churchill became a symbol of that victory. When modern Americans see Churchill, we see more than a man: we see the success of democracy over barbarism.

I would like to thank Professor Linda Ferreira-Buckley, Professor Trish Roberts-Miller, and the Liberal Arts Honors Program at the University of Texas, Austin, for their guidance and support of an earlier version of this article.

Works Cited

- Browne, Stephen H. "Encountering Angelina Grimké: Violence, Identity, and the Creation of Radical Community." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 82.1 (1996): 55–73. Print.
- Churchill, Winston. "Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat." 13 May 1940. *WinstonChurchill.org*. Web. 5 Sept. 2012.
- . "The Few." 20 Aug. 1940. *WinstonChurchill.org*. Web. 5 Sept. 2012.
- . "The Munich Agreement." 5 Oct. 1938. *WinstonChurchill.org*. Web. 5 Sept. 2012.
- . "We Shall Fight Them on the Beaches." 4 June 1940. *WinstonChurchill.org*. Web. 5 Sept. 2012.
- Darsey, James. "The Legend of Eugene Debs: Prophetic Ethos as Radical Argument." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 74.4 (1988): 434–52. Print.
- . *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America*. New York: New York UP, 1997. Print.
- Dow, Thomas E., Jr. "An Analysis of Weber's Work on Charisma." *British Journal of Sociology* 29.1 (1978): 83–93. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Mar. 2013.
- Gilbert, Martin. *Churchill: A Life*. New York: Holt, 1991. Print.
- Gulley, Halbert F. "Churchill's Speech on the Munich Agreement." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 33.3 (1947): 284–91. Print.
- Hostetler, Michael J. "The Enigmatic Ends of Rhetoric: Churchill's Fulton Address as Great Art and Failed Persuasion." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83.4 (1997): 416–28. Print.
- Jasinski, James. "Prophetic Ethos/Prophetic Speech." *Sourcebook on Rhetoric*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2001. 459–62. Print.
- Lomas, Charles W. "Churchill's Concept of His Audiences." *Western Speech* 22.2 (1958): 75–81. Print.
- "Oops! Busts of Winston Churchill Cause Obama Flap." *USA Today* 27 July 2012. Web. 1 July 2013.
- Weidhorn, Manfred. "Churchill the Phrase Forger." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 58.2 (1972): 161–74. Print.